

IFT18 Session Proposal Submission FAQs

When does the IFT18 Call for Session Proposals open and what is the deadline to submit?

The Call for Session Proposals will **open July 20, 2017** and will **close October 30, 2017 at 4:00 pm Central**. In addition, proposals for Technical Research Paper abstracts (poster presentations) will open July 15, 2017 and close December 18, 2017 at 4:00 pm Central. All details are available with links to the various Call for Proposal online submission forms currently on the [IFT17 Meeting Website](#).

Who is in charge of sessions at the IFT annual event?

An advisory panel consisting of IFT members appointed by the Office of the President are responsible for sessions at the IFT annual event. Sessions are organized by track which is a food science focus area or core science e.g. food chemistry, food safety and defense, sustainability. Each track has an advisory panel member responsible for sessions to be selected/developed for that track. The current [IFT18 Advisory Panel](#) is available for your reference.

How do I know what topics may be of interest to IFT members and general food science audiences?

Each year the advisory panel overseeing the development of all sessions for the IFT annual event set forth topical priorities by track. Sessions are structured by tracks which are food science focus areas and cores sciences e.g. food chemistry, food safety and defense, food engineering, sustainability. There are 12 total tracks including programming for academics and professional development. The IFT18 track descriptions and topics are available on the IFT18 Call for Proposals web page.

If I submit a proposal does that mean it is automatically accepted to be presented at IFT17?

No. Submitting a session proposal does not guarantee acceptance for presentation at IFT18. Every session proposal goes through an extensive peer-review process in which several IFT members from industry, academia and government review proposals. On average, each proposal is reviewed by at least 50 different food science professionals from industry, academia and government who are IFT members.

What information is required to submit a session proposal?

Anyone may submit a session proposal for IFT18. Keep in mind the broader the focus of your proposal, the more it will appeal to a larger audience. Requirements include:

- Session title
- Detailed session description describing what new research, application, technology, and or trend will be covered in your session and how it is novel to the food industry.
- Two learning objectives – What will the attendee takeaway from the session and be able to apply within their own work.
- Select which IFT track (food science focus area) your proposal most closely relates to.
- Indicate if the proposed content has been presented anywhere else within the past two years.
- Describe what interactions presenters will develop within their own presentations to engage attendees.
- Presenter names, presenter job titles, presenter companies/institutions
- Presentation title for each presenter
- Presentation description for each presenter – extremely important for reviewers to have a thorough understanding of what you are proposing for your session

It is strongly recommended you talk directly with each presenter you identified in your proposal before submitting to make sure what is being proposed for each presenter can actually be delivered to attendees. Many submissions are not highly scored because there is little description for what each presenter will cover. Providing detailed presentation descriptions (e.g. include research data, trend analysis, brief outline of a case study) is extremely important for reviewers to give your proposal full consideration.

What is the maximum number of presenters in a session?

On average, there are three to four presenters per session depending on the focus and amount of content to present within a typical 90-minute session. It is recommended to not have more than four presenters so each presenter has enough time to take a deeper dive into the science they are presenting. For example, if you are proposing a symposium, that format is typically a 90-minute session with each presenter speaking one right after another. Four presenters in a 90-minute time period would allow 20 minutes for each presentation, leaving a few minutes for brief introductions and at least

five minutes at the end for questions with the audience. Keep in mind IFT is putting greater emphasis on each presenter interacting with attendees during their presentations which can take up more time than just a standard lecture. Panel discussion formats may have up to five or six presenters.

Can presenters be from the same company or organization?

Session proposals with presenters from the same company or organization are not widely accepted. It is important to identify a diverse group of presenters to give a broad perspective to the proposed topic. It is okay to have differing views and our attendees are receptive to those sessions. Two presenters from the same company or organization may be considered if there is at least one other presenter and a moderator from different companies/organizations. Sessions should focus on the science and/or application of the topic, not commercial or marketing aspects.

Can I submit just one presenter for a session proposal?

It is highly suggested to identify at least two presenters from different companies or organizations in your session proposal. This will show the depth and varying perspectives to be covered.

What if I don't know yet who I'd like to present in my session?

If you don't know yet who you would have present, give it more thought, reach out to colleagues or any network of professionals (if you're an IFT member, IFT Connect is available to reach other members) to help you identify presenters appropriate for your proposed topic. Past reviewers have indicated they cannot give full consideration to session proposals with minimal presenter details. If you have problems identifying presenters, you may need to reconsider the focus or your proposal.

Do I have to have a moderator identified in my session proposal?

Yes. You will be asked to identify your moderator. You may select yourself as moderator or another presenter, or you may identify a moderator other than those presenting, but you will need to list a moderator in your proposal.

Can I start my submission, save it as a draft and finish it at a later date to submit?

Yes! You may start a draft submission, save your work, log out and later log back in to access your draft and continue your work. Once you submit your proposal, you may also go back in and edit any information before the deadline of October 30, 2017. If you do not submit your proposal before October 30, 2017, it will not be reviewed therefore it cannot be considered for acceptance. If you go back in and edit your submitted proposal, your proposal will still be marked as submitted so it will be reviewed in whatever state you last edited.

Will presenters know I listed them as presenters on my proposal?

Yes. Presenters will receive a notification once you submit your proposal that they have been listed as presenters. They will be able to see a copy of your proposal, including the specific presentation details you wrote for your presenters. Presenters will be able to edit/update their own contact information and add their bio, and they will also be able to edit their own presentation details. This is why it is very important to let presenters know in advance you are listing them on your proposal. They can help you draft their own presentation details. Changes cannot be made after October 30, 2017 so if you would like your presenters to review what you submitted, please submit early so they have time to do so before the deadline. Moderators will also receive a notification they have been identified as such.

What is the review process?

More than 300 IFT members who are topical experts are reviewers and on average each proposal is reviewed by more than 50 members. Each proposal is reviewed and scored using the same review criteria:

- Scientific merit
- Relevancy to the food science industry
- Multiple and varied presenters from different organizations
- Innovation
- Multidisciplinary focus (in particular for key focus area tracks)
- Delivery interaction
- Practical application of educational content
- Relevance to tracks' focus and topical priorities, and
- Pertinence to target audience(s)

Upon conclusion of the review, the advisory panel (appointed by the IFT Office of the President comprised of members who are industry experts) select proposals to be accepted based on the overall scores and comments from reviewers.

Who reviews session proposals?

IFT members who are topical experts elect to review sessions by track. On average, more than 300 members volunteer to review proposals each year. Each session proposal has an average of 50 reviewers.

When will I be notified if my proposal has been accepted?

Status notifications for session proposals will be emailed to each submitter by January 22, 2018.

Can sessions be sponsored?

All IFT18 Sponsorship opportunities will be available on the IFT18 web site this Fall, 2017.

Are previous proposals available to refer to that have scored highly?

Yes, below is a session proposal that scored extremely high and was accepted for presentation. Please note the level of detail provided in the session and presentation descriptions. The learning objectives were thorough and concise. Presenters were all from different companies or organizations. These sessions also rated well above average for quality and usefulness by session attendees.

Session Title: Economically Motivated Adulteration: Challenges and Innovations in the Detection of Food Fraud

Primary Track: Food Safety & Defense

Secondary Track: Public Policy, Food Laws & Regulations

Collaborating Division(s): Quality Assurance; Toxicology & Safety Evaluation

Session Proposal Type: Symposium

Two Part Session:

Session Description: Economically Motivated Adulteration (EMA), or food fraud, is the deliberate adulteration of food or food ingredients for economic gains, and includes dilution, substitution, origin masking, or the addition of unapproved additives. EMA results in the loss of supply chain transparency and security, diminishes consumer confidence, manipulates economic markets, increases public health threats, and undermines sustainability efforts. With the global and complex food supply chain, EMA can have international impacts with far-reaching consequences. Food fraud has often been considered to be foremost an economic issue and less a concern of food safety or food protection. However, a number of EMA incidents over the years have resulted in thousands of illnesses and hundreds of deaths of consumers. An example of an EMA incident with extremely serious safety consequences is the adulteration of infant formula with melamine in China, which in 2008 led to deaths and thousands of babies becoming ill. By the very nature of such adulteration, the perpetrators engineer fraudulent ingredients so that they can evade existing quality assurance (QA) and quality control (QC) systems implemented by purchasers, including GMP testing, hazard analysis, and critical control points (HACCP) plans. Because most perpetrators are focused on economic gain and evading QA systems, and likely do not carry out a suitable risk assessment, the public health risk associated with adulterated ingredients is often unknown until illnesses are reported. Besides the need to use trusted and reliable suppliers, the development of rapid and sensitive analytical methods to detect food adulteration before it reaches the consumer is of extreme importance. Over the last decades, EMA has prompted extensive research and development on analytical detection methods and tools. Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy (FTIR) and Raman spectroscopy, together with chemometrics, are considered some of

the most promising techniques for this purpose. This symposium will first introduce some background into the EMA practices, both historically and contemporary, and provide the audience with the FDA Office of Criminal Investigation responsibilities, capabilities and perspectives of food fraud. Then novel and emerging methods and technologies for food fraud detection, including FTIR, ICP-MS, and advanced chemometrics will be presented. Case studies will also be presented, including the detection and quantification of diluents and substitutes in olive oil, argan oil, seafood and several food ingredients, and the detection of origin masking in fava 'Santorinis' and Italian craft beer.

Learning Objective One: Provide the audience with some background into the EMA practices, both historically and contemporary.

Learning Objective Two: Introduce the audience to novel and emerging methods and technologies for food fraud detection.

People associated with Proposal (Organizer, Presenters, Moderator):

Organizer: Ana Paula Craig,
N/A, Applied Food Sciences

Presenter: George F. Hughes,
Counterterrorism and Intelligence, FDA Office of Criminal Investigation

Presentation Title: FDA's Office of Criminal Investigations Perspective of Food Fraud

Presentation Description: The objective of this presentation is to provide a thorough background on the "roles, responsibilities and capabilities" of the FDA Office of Criminal Investigations (OCI) and their perspective of food fraud. The presentation will highlight FDA working relationships with partners in the law enforcement, intelligence, public health communities and the private sector. Discussed will be the function of FDA/OCI supporting the FDA mission of protecting FDA regulated products and ensuring their safety for public consumption. Various food fraud investigations will be highlighted.

Presenter: John H. Kalivas, Ph.D.
Department of Chemistry, Idaho State University

Presentation Title: Chemometric Processes for Food Authentication and Adulteration Analysis

Presentation Description: Classification processes are presented to detect and quantitate adulterants in food matrices. Two case studies use fluorescence spectroscopy to detect Economically Motivated Adulteration (EMA) in Argan oil and extra virgin olive oil (EVOO). Quantitative adulteration of commercial Argan oil and EVOO are also presented. Two food authentication issues are also addressed. The first involves using ICP-MS for "fava Santorini" a yellow split pea species from Greece with protected designation of origin. The other research involves origin determination of Italian craft beer with five instruments.

Presenter: Luis Rodriguez-Saona,
Food Science and Technology, FDA Office of Criminal Investigation

Presentation Title: Advances in Portable Vibrational Spectroscopy Technologies for Screening Economically-Motivated Adulteration of Food Ingredients

Presentation Description: This presentation will cover fundamentals and advances in portable vibrational spectroscopy technologies for screening Economically Motivated Adulteration (EMA) of food ingredients. Portable instrumentation for use in out-of-lab applications are uniquely positioned for rapid on-site authentication of incoming ingredients because of its speed, ruggedness, compactness, ease of use and transportation. Vibrational spectroscopy provides fingerprinting capabilities for reliable authentication programs for high-value food ingredients, Applications on several food ingredients will be covered.

Presenter: Nicholas Phelps, Ph.D.
College of Veterinary Medicine, University of Minnesota

Presentation Title: Comprehensive Assessment of Fish Fraud in Minnesota

Presentation Description: This presentation will describe a comprehensive assessment of fish fraud in the retail market of Minnesota (MN). This assessment was achieved by 1) obtaining and documenting consumer-level supply chain

information for walleye, halibut, tuna, and salmon at retail outlets in MN; 2) determining the prevalence of mislabeling of these fish species in the MN retail market; and 3) performing a qualitative assessment of regulatory, retail, and consumer knowledge and opinions of fish fraud in MN retail markets and identifying the greatest opportunities for fraud in the supply chain. In total, 311 samples from 101 retail locations were collected and tested for species authenticity using PCR and COI gene sequencing. For the 295 samples where quality results were obtained, accuracy rates for species authenticity were as follows: walleye 98%, salmon 93%, halibut 86%, and tuna 83%. The levels of substitution identified in this survey were similar to surveys done by FDA; however, inconsistent with similar efforts led by other groups such as Oceana. Availability of information on the supply chains for the sampled fish was found to be sparse, highlighting the need for increased transparency in the seafood supply chain. Interviewed stakeholders indicated a growing awareness of seafood species substitution, that EMA of fish is perceived to be an economic rather than food safety concern, and that increasing oversight of product accuracy is needed. The findings of this project will help inform evidence-based policy-making, and protect the health of consumers.

Moderator: Luis Rodriguez-Saona,
Food Science and Technology, Ohio State University